

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated January 12, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claim 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0024628 to *Walker* (hereinafter "*Walker*"). Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 61-055625 to *Yamamoto* (hereinafter "*Yamamoto*"). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0013920 to *Hashimoto* (hereinafter "*Hashimoto*").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

With this response, claim 16 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 16 and 21-23 are currently pending in this application with claims 1-15 and 24-28 having been withdrawn in response to the Examiner's requirement for restriction.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 16 has been amended to comply with the written description requirement. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 16 and 21-23 fully comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and respectfully requests that § 112 rejection will be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker*. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to

claim 16 above, and further in view of *Yamamoto*. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of *Hashimoto*.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “providing a plurality of tables at a side of a transferring path of a plurality of substrates; providing a plurality of first dispensers for forming a silver dot and a plurality of second dispensers for forming a seal pattern, wherein the plurality of first dispensers are installed on one side of each table and the plurality of second dispensers are installed on the other side of said each table; respectively loading the plurality of substrates on the plurality of tables, wherein the plurality of tables respectively and independently operate; supplying silver paste to the plurality of first dispensers including a plurality of first syringes and sealant to the plurality of second dispensers including a plurality of second syringes; supplying sealant instead of silver paste to the plurality of first dispensers including the plurality of first syringes if silver dot is not required according to a model of a liquid crystal display panel; simultaneously supplying silver paste to the substrates having a plurality of unit panels through first nozzles at the end of the plurality of first syringes and sealant to the substrates through second nozzles at the end of the plurality of second syringes; and simultaneously supplying sealant to the substrates through the first nozzles and second nozzles if silver dot is not required according to the model of the liquid crystal display panel”.

As described in the present invention, when a dispenser for seal pattern and a dispenser for silver dot are respectively formed at both sides of one table, a seal process and a silver dot process may be performed all in the same apparatus, and accordingly processing steps may be reduced in comparison with a case performing the sealing process and the silver process separately.

However, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is allowable over the cited references.

Accordingly, claim 16 and claim 21, which depends either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, are allowable over *Walker*. Moreover, claim 22, which depends either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, is allowable over *Walker*, and further in view of *Yamamoto*. Claim 23, which depends either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, is allowable over *Walker*, and further in view of *Hashimoto*.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: April 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant